

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Claims 1-13 remain pending. The claims are not amended by this response.

§103 Rejection of Claims 1-13

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,154,771; hereinafter referred to as “Rangan”) in view of Jackson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,990,941; hereinafter referred to as “Jackson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Regarding claim 1, as shown above, claim 1 calls for:

1. (Previously Presented) A transmitting method comprising steps of:
 - multiplexing a signal of a picture including a selectable object with information relevant to the selectable object in the picture; and
 - transmitting the multiplexed picture signal;
 - wherein a visible symbol to which reference is made when selecting the selectable object is presented in the picture corresponding to the selectable object,
 - the relevant information indicates display content, a zooming start position, and a zooming end position, and
 - when the selectable object is selected by referring to the symbol, the display content is displayed on a screen by zooming in according to the zooming start position and the zooming end position.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the information indicating the zooming start position and the zooming end position is multiplexed with the signal of the picture. When the selectable object is selected, the display content for the selectable object is displayed by zooming

in according to the zooming positions. Therefore, the zooming for the selectable object in the picture is controlled using information multiplexed with the signal for the picture. By providing the zooming positions with the signal for the picture, the provider of the signal can control how the display content is displayed. For example, the provider of the signal can control which part of the picture will be obscured by the display content after zooming. In one example, for display content indicating information for an actress shown in the picture, the zooming positions can be specified to avoid obscuring the actress (see, e.g., pages 15-16 of the Specification and Figures 5A and 5B). In another example, where the display content and zooming positions are for an object in the picture representing a consumer item sold by a particular company, that company may want to avoid having the display content obscure certain parts of the picture showing other objects sold by the same company. Hence, multiplexing the signal of the picture with the information for the zooming positions advantageously supports control of the placement of the display content at the source of the multiplexed signal (e.g., the broadcaster).

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner argues that Rangan and Jackson show claim 1. However, it does not appear that the arguments presented by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1 over Rangan and Jackson establish how the cited combination shows or suggests multiplexing the signal for a picture with information indicating zooming positions as called for in claim 1. In Section 4, the Examiner appears to argue that zooming is well known and that using zooming start and end positions is inherent in zooming. Even assuming that using zooming start and end positions may be inherent in zooming, zooming in to show an item in a picture does not inherently disclose using zooming start and end positions indicated by information multiplexed with the signal for the picture. Zooming start and end positions could be provided or generated in various ways. For example, zooming positions could be selected by

the device displaying the picture without receiving any zooming positions from the signal for the picture. Accordingly, it is submitted that using information indicating zooming start and end positions multiplexed with the signal of a picture is not inherent in zooming generally. Without further explanation by the Examiner, it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Rangan and Jackson shows or suggests this aspect of claim 1.

Accordingly, it does not appear that the Examiner has established how the cited combination of Rangan and Jackson, as referenced by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1, shows or suggests at least these aspects of amended claim 1, and so it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Rangan and Jackson shows or suggests amended claim 1 as a whole. Claims 2-6 and 11 depend from claim 1, and it is also submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Rangan and Jackson shows or suggests claims 2-6 and 11, through their dependence on claim 1. Similar arguments apply to claims 7 and 8, and so to claims 9 and 12 that depend from claim 7, and to claims 10 and 13 that depend from claim 8.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-13 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Rangan and Jackson, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-13 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-13 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Hans R. Mahr, Reg. No. 46,138 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800